



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,462	12/05/2005	Mirko Lehmann	1001/0167PUS1	4952
60601 7590 08/13/2010 Muncy, Geissler, Olds & Lowe, PLLC 4000 Legato Road Suite 310 FAIRFAX, VA 22033				
EXAMINER				
ENIN-OKUT, EDUE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1795				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/13/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

<b>Application No.</b> 10/536,462	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LEHMANN, MIRKO
<b>Examiner</b> Edu E. Enin-Okut	<b>Art Unit</b> 1795

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 30 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-23 and 25.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Stephen J. Kalafut/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795

/Edu E. Enin-Okut/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues the following in its remarks filed on July 30, 2010:

(a) A terminal disclaimer filed on July 30, 2010 overcomes the double patenting rejection presented in the previous Office Action (p. 2).

The above-described terminal disclaimer has yet to be approved at the time of this Office Action. Until review and approval of the terminal disclaimer, the double patenting rejections would be maintained.

(b) With respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejections presented in the previous Office Action, the recitation made in claim 12 is supported by Fig. 2 of the original disclosure; and, a substituted specification supports the recitation made in claim 23 (p. 2).

As to claim 12, the figure does not show as fuel sensor disposed in the reservoir. Further, although applicant states that the specification supports the recitation made in the claim, applicant does not provide a citation to the portion of the specification provided this support.

As to claim 23, applicant appears to contend that the "fuel delivery device" described in the portions of the specification cited applicant equates to the reservoir recited in the claim. However, it is noted that the specification describes a fuel delivery device and a reservoir as separate components. Thus, its contention that these devices are one in the same is unpersuasive. (Further, the portion of the specification cited by applicant does not discuss measuring the resistance of the reservoir, as recited in the claim.)

(c) The Tanaka reference does teach that a fuel electrode is surrounded by a hydrogen absorber (p. 4).

First, it should be noted that the courts have held that "[t]he use of patents as references is not limited to what the patentees describe as their own inventions or to the problems with which they are concerned. They are part of the literature of the art, relevant for all they contain." In *re Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Second, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In *re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In this case, the Tanaka reference teaches incorporation of this material into the structure of a compact fuel cell used in portable devices to serve as a reservoir of fuel when the initial fuel source is not available without the provision of any additional apparatus (Abstract; para. 26, 27, 28). Thus, as stated in the previous Office Action, the skilled artisan would readily appreciate that incorporation of a layer of this material in the fuel cell of Jankowski can provide useful characteristics to the cell as described by Tanaka.

(d) The Tanaka reference does not teach an integrated fuel cell (p. 4-5).

First, as discussed directly above, it should be noted that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In *re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Further, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In *re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In *re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).